G. R. S. 59] GPB—15,000—20-12-13

GENERAL AND REVENUE SECRETARIAT.

~~191~~ . 1898.
(Courts.)

File No. 95.

Serial Nos. 1—12

Papers Filed.

Month May 1901.

SUBJECT.

Complaints made by the inhabitants of Hole-Narsipur against the Munsiff of the place

PREVIOUS REFERENCES.	LATER REFERENCES.
Commenced No 1 Indexed.	B. K. Narasimha Iyengar

To Just Branch

Please see the Hy Rivers's Order that a Reply should be given to the Petitioners, which has to be carried out.

2. Please note that the Defendants in the last name of his Counsel to Report asks for the Withdrawal of this Petition.

26/8/99

Draft to each. Hope

AR 27/8

on petition 3
16. 1. 99

(6) 2

Petition dated 18th November 1900, from Rangamma and others of Hole Narsipur.

Petitioners acknowledge receipt of the endorsement dated 4th September No 3484/360, given to them, intimating that their complaints against Mr Krishnasamiengar, the Mensiff of the place, are unfounded —

They represent that not one of them has put in his signature to the so called petition, that it gives them much pain to hear that they have complained against the Munsiff who is working most satisfactorily. They therefore pray that if their signatures have been inserted in the original petition, the same may be ordered to be sent over to Hole Narsipur for needful enquiries being instituted in the matter — 156.11

BR
29/11

29/11/00

3

The references ordered to be submitted are herewith submitted

Hua
22/12

Subd. to Mgr. D'Evan.
I have called for explanation of delay in submitting these refs and in the meantime beg to submit them to save time.

22/12

The following are the references ordered to be submitted by the above candidate

D.O.
23/12/19

ROUTINE NOTES.

[To be used only for notes, requisitions, etc.

Before submitting to Govt

Was not the Amb questioned about this matter? If so, why does not say so clearly in the draft. Please see again & let me know very early. We shd not send another reply liable to be objected to as insufficient.

18/5

During the month of Jan/99. when the British Resident visited Hole Narsipur, one Rangamma and several other inhabitants thereof handed to him in open a petition in a cover. That officer knowing that it was an address of welcome or something of that sort, took it into the carriage and drove in without reading the same. But shortly after he found that it was a complaint petition against the Amildar of that place & that it was signed by various persons. He sent for

The Amildar was transferred to Nadagini by notification dated 2nd Feby 1899. Just 3 or 4 days after the date of the Resident's visit to Hole Narsipur. The next Commissioner's tour was held somewhere about June 1899, which time the Amildar had left the station. The record does not show that he was questioned about the incident even by correspondence. P.J.G.

N. B.—Should notes, etc., be written on small slips the notes must be copied, or the slips pasted on this form.

worked

5

ed to the Dewan requesting him to look into the matter and take such action as he may deem fit. The Dewan thereupon forwarded the petition marked "Confidential" for enquiry and report.

The allegations made in the complaint-petition are as follows:—

That for nearly two months after the arrival of Mr. Krishnaswamiengar to Hole Narsipur he administered justice equally to all.

That during his removal to one Sathikal Raghavendrachar's house he changed his conduct.

As we have ascertained ourselves that the petitioner was a genuine one and as the enquiry about the statements made by the Resident on the one hand and the allegations made in the petition on the other have been imposed upon by making a bogus petition in the absence of the Amildar's evidence does not seem to be very material

15-5-01

This may be submitted to the Dewan.

15/5

Rec'd 16/5/01. off. 611

N. B.—Should notes, etc., be written on small slips the notes must be copied, or the slips pasted on this form.

and became the leader
of his sect as well as
of some madhva —
Brahmins who were
hostile to other re-
ligious orders in the
town.

That the said Sree-
vaishnavas and —
madhva Brahmins
re- the existence of
the mussiff publi
- ly despised and
disgraced the other
religious orders in
the temple of nara-
simha swami -

That the mussiff

Contrary

contrary to the custom
and usage, had one of
his own Alwars in
procession;
That on the 3rd Dec/98
at his instance, the
worshipper at the
temple of Narasimha
Swami served a
Theertha and prasada in the
first instance to one
Seeranivasanara
Brahmin who had
been sent for, for
the purpose, in preference
to one Ranganadabhatta
a Smartha Brahmin
as usual;

that the municipality along with the repairs of the Alwar temple got a mantapam (styled as Vasanta mantapam) repaired and intended to place in the middle Ankanam thereof, one of the figures of his own Guru, contrary to the views and principles of other religious orders;

That he carried his religious zeal to the Bench at which he

he presided;

That he was taking down the evidence of witnesses in his own hand in Canarese contrary to the usage of other Courts;

That the memorialists experienced terrible hardships in the dispensation of justice caused by the Munsiff's fanaticism;

That he might be transferred to a place where there would be less scope for the exercise of his power

in sympathising with the whims and caprices of his own caste and creed at the cost of public justice and another who would do full justice might be brought in his stead.

The Deputy Commr. of Hassan enquiring into the above allegations× reported as follows :-

That the idol of Aswan was led in procession on three occasions as usual on the birthday of Rama rajaha, the Kotara and

car

× Please see confidential his report dated 16th June 1899. Serial no 2 in the file.

W
car festival, and that
nothing contrary to
manual was done,
that the Amildar ~~who~~
~~was called upon to~~
~~stood explain what~~
~~he knew in the matter,~~
explained in his affidavit, ~~that he knew nothing~~ did not say anything
of the circumstances of this
incident, but he made
allegations similar
to those in the peti-
-tion under enquiry;
2. That in the matter
of distribution of
Prasadha and Prasad
on 3rd December last
in presence of the
munsiff by a new

Sinalero 12 of fil
ao B.

Anchik to a Sivavaishna
an Brahmin in pre-
ference to one Ranjuna
bhatta as usual, the
munsif very probably
had a hand in it.

That as regards the
seating of Alwar in
the middle Ankanam
of Vasanta mantap-
am, the munsif and
other Sivavaishna-
an Brahmins re-
quested the deputy
Commr. to allow them
to do so, which was
declined, that there-
on, the munsif took
a leading part in
merely getting the mantap
repaired

that therefore there was nothing blameable in his conduct;

4. That the munsiff was in the habit of recording evidence in Kannada in with his own hand during the past several months with the permission of the Chief Court and that he adhered to it even at Kalasapur.

That the above procedure did not mean that he carried his religious zeal to the Bench and that he thereby did a

~~di~~ injustice between
man & man in cases
going before him,
as a judge.

That the house of
Raghavendrachar
was repaired at a
cost of Rs 600 or 700,
that the munsiff re-
mained there only
as a tenant and that
there was nothing
objectionable in
him occupying the
house; That the peti-
somewhat exaggera-
-ed their statements
and that there was
no evidence to infer

that he instigated Sree-
vaishnavas and madh-
vas to act in an hostile
manner towards other
religious orders. that
however the orthodox
behaviour of the mun-
siff coupled with
the unbecoming conduct
of some Sreevaishnava
Brahmins created some
discontent among others.

That there was also
an impression among
some persons that he
was not so lenient
in favour to non-Sree-
vaishnava lawyers
as he was to Hebbar
pleaders.

That there was some ill-feeling between the munsiff and the Amildar in respect of the imposition by the latter of a small fine on temple servants who at the instance of the former officer had lopped off some ~~bran~~ branches of a Punga tree situated in the temple; that the munsiff ~~a~~ next passed certain observations against the Amildar Subbayah Naidu who was cited as a witness in O.S. no 288 of 1898-99 on the file of his Court; that the

the above and other circumstances gave rise to complaints against the munsiff, that the above would further be established by the ~~[illegible]~~ short interval between the ~~[illegible]~~ date of the passing of the judgment and the date of the complaint petition (viz 5th January 1899 & 16th January 1899; that it might as well be said that the petition was not pseudonymous and that it was signed by several persons though they were not eye witnesses;

That on the whole

the Munsiff was ~~was~~ an honest man and that there was ~~no~~ nothing blameable in his conduct or moral character, that the only circumstance which rendered him unpopular was his orthodox behaviour towards the non-Smarta Brahmins.

After the receipt of the above report, the petitioners were informed in reply to their petition

Please see no 3484
3360
of 4-9-00.
Serial no 4 of
J. file no ~~28 of 1899~~
28 of 1899-1900.

petition to the addresp
of the Honourable
the Resident as well
as to a similar peti-
tion subsequently
addressed to the Dewan,
on this office endorse-
ment no 3484 dated
J 260
4-9-00 that their
complaints were
unfounded. The
above endorsement - which was meant to me
Bhe. Rayanna.
was misdelivered
to one another Gowda Rangan-
na who was not a
party to the complaint-
petition. He being
surprised at this, con-
-sulted his friends
and other merchants

and concluded that bogus petitions falsely purporting to have originated from him were presented to Govt. and that they showed petition the same, about the bogus nature ~~nature~~ of the petitions in question. Accordingly one Narasimhachetty and other residents who were not signatories to the original petitions, presented a petition dated 18-11-00 to Govt.

Govt. stating that they made no complaints against the munsiff who was working most satisfactorily and requesting that if their signatures had been inserted in the original petitions, the same might be ordered to be sent to Honble. Commission for needful action. Thereupon the above petition was received in Govt. Pro: No and no 8567-68 / 9953 dated 3-1-00 and copies whereof were sent to

Serial no 7 of file no 28 of 1899-00.

the Deputy Commis-
sioner, Kassam, the
Registrar, Chief Cl
and the Resident in
my save, with a D.O.
dated 27-11-00 for
information with
reference to his D.O.
dated 16-1-99.

The latter Offi
Officer in acknow-
ledging the above
copy of proceedings
stated that the decision
arrived at was barely
intelligible, that the
petition was present-
ed to him personally
by some one in
public

public, that there
should have been
no difficulty in ~~e~~
ascertaining who present-
-ed the same when it had
~~[illegible]~~ evidently been signed
by one Ruganna and
others, that whether
they disclaimed all
knowledge of the
complaint, and that
even if the petition
was unfounded, the ~~e~~
manner in which it
was disposed of,
required that some-
thing more had to be
done in the matter,
that if it was evidently
a bogus petition that

some steps should be taken to ascertain who imposed upon him & whether any State officials witnessed the imposture.

In forwarding all the petitions, the Deputy Commr. was again requested to enquire into the following points more minutely & submit a detailed report on the same:

The replies thereto received from the Asst. Commr. in charge Hassan D.C.,

enquired

in this office no 9340 dt 21/11/1938
Serial no 10 of the
file no 28 of 1900-01.

with his no

Mr. Arunachalam

enquired into the same under instructions from the Deputy Commissioner are shown in juxtaposition.

(1). Is the first of the petitions referred to above genuine?

(2). Do the signatories thereto admit their signatures or if not is there any evidence in proof of such signatures?

The first of the petitions dated 16-1-99 is genuine, 12 out of 71 persons signed to the petn were examined and 11 of them admit their signatures. (Please see statement-D) Ranga Narasimha, Sheikdar of Kalavarsipur Hobli recognizes the signs of 48 persons. Besides some of the School boy appear to have signed the petitions. ~~It~~ It may be observed ~~that~~ from the

Column 1 of Statement

(appended to the report) that all the
Signatories to the peti-
tions are Emarthas
in persuasion. Next one
Rasumbhatta a signatory
to the ~~original~~ single petition
says that before wel-
coming the Hon'ble the
Resident, the Emarthas
of the locality collected
themselves at the Rama-
devaru temple where
the petition in question
was first read and
explained to them and
then they were exhorted
to affix their signatures
to it which they did
gladly, voluntarily
and with full knowledge
of its contents. The
above appears to be

a deliberate exaggeration or deliberate exaggeration since the petition was written in English since the petition was written in English a language quite unknown to them. However there is ample reason to presume that the petition was within the knowledge of the signatories. Further there prevails in the town of Kalmunai, that whenever a petition to the Court is got up, to take it round to the other inhabitants thereof, represent orally its contents, solicit and obtain their signatures.

(3) By whom was that petition presented to the Honourable the Resident in his carriage, who were the Durbar Officers and Officials present at the time of such a presentation and why did the latter fail to take notice of the impostures if it was a bogus petition?

no person comes forward to state as to who were the persons that presented the petition and who were the Durbar officers and officials present at the time, but however it is ascertained that the Lumbadi Brahmins who had collected themselves in a pandal erected in front of the Travellers Bungalow, being led by one Lakshminarayana pundit (a brother of the Jeeyangi mutt, who is since dead) welcomed the Honble the Resident with a Slokas, coloured silk flowers

flowers and fruits and
presented a petition
folded up in the print-
tray. Amilcar Lubuay
raider, appears also to
have been there and
permitted the presenta-
tion of fruits and
flowers, but he took
no notice of it either
because he was ignora
of the presentation of
the petition or being
aware of it he did not
think any steps neces-
sary in view of the fact
that the petition was
apparently a genuine
one.

the Resident-

(4). Who are the signatories to the 3rd petition dated 18-11-00 above adverted to, are they the same as the persons by whom the 1st petition to the Resident and the 2nd to the Dewan has been signed, and if so why did they disclaim all knowledge of them?

The 2nd petition addressed to the Dewan is clearly a pseudonymous one, the handwriting and the signatures are feigned. Also authors cannot be traced. There are however circumstances pointing out its connection with the sectarian clique from whom the first petition emanated - no further notice need therefore be taken of it.

The 3rd petition dated 18-11-00 was presented

presented by a majority of the non-Brahmanical classes in consequence of the misdelivery to them of the endorsement on the first petition. This was moreover intended to convince Govt. that they disclaimed all knowledge of the 1st petition since none of them had subscribed his ~~se~~ signature to it. Their representation to the above effect is natural and prompted by good ~~reasons~~ instincts.

1/5) If either the 1st or the 2nd or both are admitted or proved, why shd not the signatories thereto be called upon to substantiate the allegations therein made and if they fail to do so, why shd not suitable action be taken against them?

Reasons have already been assigned for disbelieving that the first petition was unquestionably a genuine one, while the 2nd was pseudonymous feigned and a bogus one. Of the 11 persons who admit their signatures to the 1st petn, none is able or willing to substantiate the allegations contained in the petition. The statement therein certainly appears to have been prompted

by malicious motives
and engendered by sectari-
-an animosity, but yet
it is not easy to see the
evil fruits brought to
book without entail-
-ing upon our Krishna-
swamiengar the trouble
and anxiety of being
a prosecutor in a
criminal prosecu-
-tion. There are among
the signatories to the
first petition a no
of Govt. servants,
(please see statement
(B) in whose cases
departmental enquiry
is

(B) appended to his report)

× ~~The~~ Deputy Commr. says in his memo. that the officials are shrewd & that ~~the~~ they may be imposition of small fines ~~be imposed~~ on them or a warning will be ~~was~~ sufficient ~~reason~~ ~~case~~ in their cases.

may be held - and if it is established that they had taken any part in the transaction some punishment may also be inflicted upon them.

(6). Was any statement taken from the signatories to the first and second petitions on any evidence of witnesses pro and con recorded, before the Deputy Commr. submitted his confidential report dated the 16th June/09 and if so where is the record thereof?

The Asst. Commr. has not answered this query. But the Deputy Commr. states as follows:-

"The enquiry being one of confidential nature, the persons concerned were orally examined as to the truth or otherwise of the allegations and no statement was taken from

35

from any of the signatories nor any evidence of witnesses recorded in his presence. All the available records were submitted along with his confidential report for the information of Govt.

The.

This above report is now forwarded for the information of Govt. by the Commr. Hassan Dt. with his Docket no 604 of 6th April 01.

Submitted.
ma
26/4

Draft D.O. dtd
to Secy. the facts are
given therein briefly.
6-5-01.

Submitted to the Dewan
with a draft d.d.
letter to the Resident
for approval.
1575

Draft D.O. to the Hon. Resident.

My dear ~~Sir,~~

With reference to ~~your note~~ of the 12th January last to the address of the late officiating Dewan, Mr.Thamboo Chetty, regarding the circumstances under which a complaint was presented to you direct at Hole Narsipur against the Munsiff of that place, I ~~beg~~ to state as follows.

2. From enquiries made by the local officers of the Hassan District, it seems clear that the petition ~~in question~~ was a genuine one, as 48 out of 71 signatures have been identified while 11 out of 12 persons examined have actually admitted their signature. The first in order of the signatories, namely "Bhu.Ranganna" is dead, but the genuineness of his signature is admitted by his son.

3. The following extract from ~~the~~ report ~~of the Assistant Commissioner deputed to make enquiry~~ embodies all the information available as to the circumstances attending the presentation of the petition.

"Owing to the lapse of time and presumably also owing to the nature of the present enquiry itself, no person appears to be willing to come forward to give any definite statement as to who were the persons that presented the petition, and who were the

the Durbar Officers or officials present at the time. From the evidence recorded and other local enquiry, however, I am able to gather that there were more than one reception pendals erected, and that one of them was so put up in front of the Travellers' Bunglow where the Smartha Brahmans of the town were collected, that a number of them led by one Lakshminarayan Pandit who represented himself as the local agent of the "Sringeri Matt", and is since dead, welcomed the Hon'ble the Resident with "slokas", coloured rice, flowers and fruits, that a petition folded up, presumably the present one, was placed in the fruit-tray, and presented with the fruits, and that the petition was retained by the Hon'ble the Resident. Shanbhogue Venkatramanaya states that Mr.Soobaroyalu Naidu,* the Amildar of the place, was then present and permitted the presentation of fruits and flowers. But nothing further is known as to who were the other officers present at the time, or even if the Amildar himself was aware that a petition was really presented with the fruits. No steps appear to have been taken by the Amildar in this connection, either because he was ignorant of the presentation of the petition, or being aware of it he did not think any steps necessary in

view

[*This officer is now at Maddapur.]

of the fact that the petition was apparently a genuine one." Mr. Arnoldan's report has never been considered

a very competent officer & is now transferred to Madanapalle

4. As regards the allegations made in the petition, the local enquiry shows, briefly, that they are due for the most part to sectarian ill-feeling excited among the signatories, who are Smartha Brahmans, by what they considered to be acts of irregularity and innovation in connection with temple worship on the part of the Srivaishnavas, and which were believed, but without good grounds, to have been ~~done~~ introduced at the instance of the Srivaisnava Munsiff. None of the signatories who were examined were able or willing to substantiate their allegation of official misbehaviour against the Munsiff. These facts having been reported to Government, they issued an endorsement to Petitioners on the 4th September 1900, informing them that, ~~their petitions having been referred~~ after an enquiry by the Deputy Commissioner ~~for enquiry, that Officer had reported that~~ the complaints made against the Munsiff ~~were~~ appeared to be unfounded.

5. Unfortunately, this endorsement was misdelivered to one "Gowda Ranganna," a Vaisya, instead of to "Bhu. Ranganna," who was by that time dead; and the result of the mistake is thus described by the Assistant Commissioner:-

"This

34

"This Gowda Ranganna, not having been privy to the petition, was surprised at the endorsement, consulted his friends and other merchants and concluded that a bogus petition falsely purporting to have originated from him was presented to the Government. He and his friends decided that the Government should be petitioned about the bogus nature of the petition in question with a view to bring its authors to book, and that personally they had no complaints whatever against Mr.Krishnaswamy Iyengar who was all that could be wished as Munsiff."

6. As the original petition presented to you had already been disposed of by the endorsement of the 4th September 1900, this petition of Gowda Ranganna and others was merely recorded in Government Order No.~~8567-68~~/ J.953, of the 27th December (3rd January) last, of which a copy was forwarded to Mr. Dobbs with the Secretary's D.O. letter of the same date.

for bribery was no doubt not a complete refutal and could easily be an adequate refutal had it been done in time. This case has been effectively when the D.O. letter was under argument and was received, but a fresh and more exhaustive enquiry was deemed necessary and an affidavit of the Hassan Bribe was, under the orders of the Dewan, put in.

(2) The Dy. Com's letter on which the Endorsement with Petn presented with Hon'ble Resident was based is also forwarded herewith and forms enclosure No 2.

Mr. Krishnaswami Iyengar has also been transferred from Holenarsipur and further action seems due

To

The Hon. ~~Col. Donald Robertson, C.S.I.~~

uncalled for.

17.V.01

THE RESIDENT MYSORE

BANGALORE.

SECTION Courts

FILE No. 95 of 98

SERIAL No. 1

My dear Dewan -

The enclosed was handed to me a week ago this morning in a cover - probably containing the address of welcome - or something of that sort - but it did not reach me

dense on which reading it:

I have made - & shall make - no

enquiry (the D.C. has returned

Mr Hanson as his wife has confirmed)

but as the petition has been

at least 100 people one looking on

presented I am of opinion it is signed

by various persons I think that

matter should be looked into as
soon as possible. If the complaint is
untrue it is only fair to the Magistrates
to let the public know this. It
is of course possible that there is no
real grievance.

Yours
D. Lloyd George.

Criccieth
16.10.99

Colonel Donald Robertson C.S.I.

British Resident

to the Govt of Mysore

Bangalore

The humble memorial of the inhabitants of Hole Narsipur. Most respectfully Showeth

That Mr. B. S. Krishna Swamy Iyengar the present Munsiff of Hole Narsipur assumed charge of his office about the middle of July 1898. When Mr Sivaprakasam Pillay the then Munsiff was transferred to Nelamangala.

Long before the arrival of the said Munsiff, during the Last visit of His Holiness the Sringeri Jagat Guru, the Srivismavas coupled with some of the Madhwas who are under an interdict of the Sotteradi Mutt attempted to prevent His Holiness from worshipping the God Narasimha personally as was usual with him, and also to prevent him from passing before the said Mutt in his cross palanquin. Subsequent to this they also attempted to place on the car of the God Narasimha one of their own Alwars, contrary to the existing custom and usage of the place. The Govt. of Mysore after carefu

inquiry and full investigation into the matter decided both the aforesaid points against them, in favour of their opponents. Since then the discontented and dissatisfied Madhvas and Srivisnavas kept quiet till the arrival of the present Munsiff, like Serpent under flower, eagerly waiting for a man of some authority, who would support and promote their own causes.

For nearly two months after the arrival of Mr. B.S. Krishna Swamy Iyengar to Hole Narsipur, he was put up in Mr Ramanna's Chattram. As long as he stopped there, he adopted the principle of non-intervention Policy, dispensing justice to one and all alike. Immediately after his removal to Sawkar Raghavendra Char's house, which was specially got up for him, by his landlord at the expense of about thousand Rupees, the Munsiff has allowed himself to be overridden by religious fanatism, or in other words his attitude towards members other than his own community took a different aspect from what it was before. The Munsiff became the leader and Commander of that party who were eagerly waiting to welcome him as their guide and support. The Srivisnavas and some of the Madhvas at the instance and guidance of the Munsiff have begun to despise and disgrace the members of other than their own community, openly in the temple in the very presence of their leader, the Munsiff. In support of this our contention, your honour's Memorialists would invite your honour's attention to the following specific instances:—

The Munsiff contrary to the Custom and usage lead one of his own Alwars in procession. He himself guided the procession for fear that members other than his own community might prevent the unusual procession.

On the 3rd of Last Month the Worshipper or pujari at the instance and advice of the Munsiff contrary to the long standing Custom and usage got the Theertha and prasada administered first to one of the members of the Munsiff's own community, who was specially sent for the occasion by him, instead of being first administered to Ranjunda Bhatta, a Smartha Brahamin, as usual.

The Munsiff along with the repairs of the Alwar temple got a Mantapam Styled as Vasanta Mantapam also repaired. Here he wants to fix one of the figures of his own Guru in the middle Ankanam of the said Mantapam which is opposed to the Sectarian Views and principles of his opponents and which, however, has not taken effect as yet.

Suffice it to say that these circumstances are enough to convince to your honour that the present Munsiff wants to promote his own religion and to suppress its members at the Sacrifice of the religious liberty and freedom (the Special boons of our Queen Victoria's Reign) of his opponents.

Your Memorialists would not have

Venture

ventured to criticise the character of the Munsiff if his religious frenzy had not extended to the threshold of his officialdom. As he has been overridden by party spirit and feeling even in his official capacity as a Judge we are afraid to expect justice at his hand while he sits on the Bench. Besides this, the novel practice of the Munsiff taking Canarese depositions in his own hand, at his will, contrary to the practice and usage of other Courts in the Province of Mysore, still more strengthens and supports our suspicion as regards his dispensation of justice. Owing to this. Owing to this if the Munsiff possesses any higher and nobler qualities all of them become subservient to his religious frenzy.

It is not unknown to your Honour that all the members of the bar as well as the clients are not members of the Munsiff's own caste and creed. Your memorialists are experiencing the terrible havoc in the dispensation of justice caused by Munsiff's fanatism.

It is not out of your honor's experience that one of the sources of happiness that your memorialists have been enjoying during the long and peaceful reign of Queen Victoria is religious toleration coupled with equality of justice to all, alike irrespective of caste and creed.

Also your honour is not unaware to what serious consequences religious persecution so to call it, of the higher authorities, specially of the tribunals who preside over the destinies of thousands of different caste and creed has lead and would lead to. Therefore your

Your honor's Memorialists bearing this inclined most humbly and respectfully beg that Your honour will kindly be pleased to get the present Munsiff Mr. B. S. Krishnaswami Iyengar transferred to such a place where there is less Scope for the Exercise of his power in Sympathising with the whims and caprices of his own caste and creed at the cost of justice, and another who would do full justice to the office he holds, as well to the public, is brought in his Stead.

For which act of kindness Your honor's Memorialists pray for Your long life and prosperity.

Your Memorialists
most humbly
beg to remain
Your honour's most obedient
& humble Servants &c

Hole Narsipur,
D/16th January 99.

[illegible]

Hassan 8

16 June 1899

Confidential

(2)

SECTION Courts
FILE No. 95/98 V
SERIAL No. 2

Sir,

With reference to the petition presented to the British Resident by some of the inhabitants of Hole Narasipura on the occasion of his visit to that place in January last and forwarded to me for confidential enquiry and report on the subject of the complaints made therein against the Munsiff Krishna Swamy Iyengar, I have the honor to submit the following.

It has been urged in the petition that Krishna Swamy Iyengar assumed charge of the

Munsiff's Court at Bodinayakanur
about the middle of July
1895 and for two months administered
justice Done and all without any
partiality that he then occupied the
house of one Sowcar Rajavaindra
Chari who had repaired it at a cost
of about Rs1000. for the purpose and
since that time there became a
change in his conduct, that he
became the leader of his sect as
well as of some Madhwa Brahmins
and assumed a hostile attitude
towards members of other religious
orders, and that he Sreevaishnavas
and the said Madhwa Brahmins
have, at the instigation of the Munsiff,
been publicly insulting the other
Brahmins in the temple. In proof
of the above allegations the petitioners

quote the following instances;
firstly that the Munsiff himself
led one of the Females of his own
Always in procession contrary
to Custom and usage lest Members
of their Main Side of his own
Community might oppose the
same, secondly that, on the 3d.
Dec last, the Archik-worshipper
in the temple, at the advice of the
Munsiff, honoured with the first-
Dola Teertha and Prasada a Sree
-vaisnava Brahmin of the Hebbar
Community who had been specially
sent for by the Munsiff, and that
this was opposed to usage accord-
to which one Ranjunda Balla, a
smartha Brahmin was entitled
to that honor, thirdly that the Munsiff
of the Vasanta Mantap in the
temple repaired and intends

[illegible] in the trial of his own
Cause, contrary to the religious
tenets of the Non-seemaishwara
Brahmins, from that he is
extending his religious zeal to the
bench at which he presides as
munsiff and that he takes down
the evidence of witnesses in Canarese
in his own hand writing to the
practice of their civil courts so as
to throw suspicion on his impartial
dispensation of justice.

With regard to the first
charge they to submit that
the idol of Ishwara is being annually
conducted in procession on three
occasions, viz, the sixth day of
Ramanavami chat, the kotura,
and car festival, and I don't
think anything contrary to
Hindoo law was done in this respect.

I have herewith forwarded an affidavit authenticated on 22.12.98 and prepared by the Amildar Subbarayaloo Naidoo recently transferred to Maddakere Taluk. This document contains allegations against the Amildar similar in import to those in the petition under enquiry, but does not allude to the incident of Alwar procession, some of the signatories to the petition appear to have even brought the matter to the notice of the Amaldar. Besides the petitioners do not state on what particular occasion they the idol was conducted in procession contrary to custom. The confidential enquiry held by me leads to the conclusion that the charge is not

well-founded

13

with regard to the second charge, viz, the illegal distribution of Teertha and Prasada, there is no doubt that, according to mamool, Ramchandra Batta is the person entitled to the first Teertha and Prasada and that it was on the 3d Dec last, when Done Ramachar, a Sreevaishnava Brahmin of Kullahalli village, in violation of mamool on that day one of the two temple archiks was sick and the other was said to have been otherwise employed delegating his duty Done Sreeniwasa Batta, archik of Marvinakere village temple, who committed the illegal act complained against. Sreeniwasa Batta is alleged to have stated that,

on the day in question, Ramjinda Batta did not occupy his usual place in the front line and thereby the Teerthia and Prasada was taken to Ramachan. The explanation of the wretch for violating the mamool is useless and unworthy of credit. He appears to have been influenced by sectarian motives to do an unjust act. The Munsiff was at the time in the temple, and, although there is no legal evidence to connect him with the wrongful act of the wretch, yet it is very probable that he had a hand in it. Ramjinda Batta who was aggrieved by the wretch's fault did not see the Munsiff or direct the wretch to violate the custom, and he complained ~~against~~ to the Amildar

against me which the aunildar
thereon ordered the temple servants
to drive me out.

The third charge with
reference to an intention on the
part of the munsiff to set up an image
of Alwar in the vasantha mantap
recently repaired. This mantap consists
of three sankanas in the last of which the
Alwar image is seated. The munsiff
and other Sreevaishnavas asked me
to allow them to set the image in the
middle sankana where the principal
idol of the temple is being seated once
a year. But I declined to
comply with their request. The munsiff
took a leading part in getting the
said new mantap repaired, but in
this I do not see anything blamable
in his conduct.

As regards the fourth
charge, there are no materials to presume

that the munsiff is influenced by his
religious zeal & does injustice
between man and man in cases
coming before as such. He takes
down the evidence of witnesses in
Canarese in his own hand and does
not require the munshi & record
the depositions and get them the
signature of the deponents as is
the case in other civil courts. This
practice of recording the evidence is
objected to by the petitioners under-
consideration. It seems that he has
been for the last several months
adhering to this mode with the per-
mission of the Chief Court.

The above disposes of the main
charges against the munsiff. The
petitioners allege that however has a
window which repaired a house it
a cost of about Rs 1000. and allowed

the Munsiff Decamp fit. The Amildar has stated in his affidavit that the house was repaired at a cost of Rs 800 or 900 and the Munsiff deemed it as a tenant. I do not see anything objectionable in the Munsiff hearing the tenant of Rajagopalachar. Whether General imputations against the Munsiff are that he, as a leader of his sect and of some wealth, has assumed a hostile attitude towards other Brahmins and that he vindicated his partisans & insulted others in the temple. The language used in the petition appears to be somewhat strong and exaggerated. The duties of the Karnatipam has been always settled finally by the Munsiff. The Munsiff became the tenant of Rajagopalachar a wealthy Brahmin of notoriety in the place

and reason the habit of frequent
attending the temple where some
Greenaishnavas used to meet
him probably with a view to
strengthen their intimacy with
him. These Greenaishnavas seem
to have led away by orthodox
sentiments Brinkh an extent as
once in the temple expressing
grief at the feelings of their
Brahmin. But there is no evidence
to prove that the plaintiff instigated
these men but in his manner.
However the orthodox behaviour
of the plaintiff, coupled with the
unbecoming conduct of some
Greenaishnavas, created some
discontent among them. There is
also an impression among some
persons that he is not so lenient
in regard to non-Greenaishnava
lawyers

case is to be heard on Tuesday next.

Rajavaramidevachar, plaintiff's landlord lived on unfriendly terms with the late Amildar and was a friend of the plaintiff. Under these unfavourable circumstances there arose some hitch between the Amildar and the plaintiff. According to the affidavit the cause of the ill-feeling was that the Amildar fined some temple servants for having ~~topped~~ lopped off branches of a Banyan tree, and the plaintiff, regarding this as an insult to himself on the ground that the branches were cut at his own instance, quarrelled with the Amildar. In O.S. No. ~~286~~ 288 of 98-99 on the file of the plaintiff's court, Covinda Narain Sait and Krishnamachi, the Narasipura bridge contractors were plaintiffs

1 and 2 respectively and one to
Chennai (Veda was
deft. The suit was for the recovery
of damages from Chennai Veda
for his having illegally attached
some brick kilns, the property of the
plaintiffs, in a decree obtained by
him against some other persons.
The Amildar was examined as
a witness in the ct case and
certain observations were
made on his evidence by the
Munsiff in the judgt. pronounced
on the 5th Jan. 1899 and herewith
submitted (vide sheet 10 second
page, sheet 11 and sheet 12 first
page in the judgt.). Under these
and other circumstances the
relations between the two officers
appeared to have become very

very much strained. The petition
under consideration is dated
6th Jan 1899 is 11 days after the
passing of the said Act and
17 days after the due authentication
of the affidavit and corresponds
with the latter in respect of contents.
This ill feeling alluded to by the
Amildar and the discontent already
described seem to have given rise
to the petition under consideration.
There is no doubt that the petition
is not spontaneous. Bombili is also
known that all the signatories to
it are not eye witnesses of one
and all the incidents therein
mentioned. Some must have
affixed their signatures but
at the request or the assurance
of others. Ramchandra Bolla, who

was visited in the matter of the
matter of the first Secretary and
Prasada and who is therefore
likely to know of the misiffs —
complicity in it. Cannot say
what part the misiff played.
The petition appears to have been
presented to the British Resident
alongwith the addresses of
welcome.

I made enquiries as
regards the misiff's character,
honesty, popularity and conduct.
I have already detailed the facts that
rendered him unpopular amongst
the people at Kla-Hanaiipun. From
the remarks made by him in his
judgt. on the Amildar's evidence
you may draw your own inference
as regards his natural & his position
If he had been a little moderate

23 Transpiring his orthodox behaviour
and if he had refrained from giving
access to the lawyers of Hebbar
& myself Dasa unwarrantable
extent there would not have been
much room for dissatisfaction
amongst the people. Thelvie
he is an officer of good moral
& character and have not
heard of complaints affecting
his honesty. In matters connected
with his utilities his conduct
seems such as to cause no displeasure
of whatsoever nature as may
be evident from the incidents of
the first Seertha and Prasada.
Since his advent to the Narasipura
the number of factions increased there
among the Brahmins. The atmosphere
of the locality is such as requires an
officer of prudence and tactics

to keep its various factions in check
of peace and union.

After the receipt of your
D.O. I paid him visits to Hosle
Narasipur. But as my stay there
was very short, I could not gather
sufficient information, so I thought
it proper to reserve the matter till
the Jamabandi of the Taluk. I
myself proceeded to the Jamabandi,
in the course of which I made it a
point to ascertain the views of the
people as regards their Munsiff-
I have now submitted the result of
my enquiry as stated above, but
I regret the delay caused in the
submission thereof and beg you
will kindly excuse for the same.

The petition under consideration

25

Letter with the British Residents
Letter ~~and Enclosure~~ is herewith
returned with a request that
the affidavit and the Midgt.
herewith submitted may be
kindly returned. One affidavit remains
to be handed over to the persons
concerned.

I have the honor to be,
Sir
Your most obedient servant

D. Devaraj

To
Put up with file
N

Sir K. Seshadri Iyer K.C.S.I

Dewan to the Govt
of Mysore
Bangalore.

The humble memorial of the inhabitants of Hole-narsipur Sub-division munisiffs court most respectfully showeth.

We submitted several memorials both to the British Resident to your Excellency and to the Chief-judge as well regarding the mal-administration, injustice, partiallity to his own cast-men, intentional-omission to record the statements of witenesses and parties or moulding them to his

whims and caprices, of our present munisiff Mr. B. S. Krishna-Swami-Iyengar with a request to remedy these evils. But owing to our misfortune none of them proved successful.

Besides this several affadavits have been filed before the District-Judge along with the memorandum of appeals complaining the aforesaid things. But he has turned a deafear to all such affadavits and applications. Neither did he care to come here and ~~said~~ set the matters right which he could easily have done on his way to Hassan for sessions. The cause for this is not far to seek since both of them being Velbar-

Iyengars.

It is not out of place for us to state here that liberxty free-dom and justice which we were peacefully enjoying ever since the Rendition have now been interefered with by the arbitrery proceedings and conduck of our president munsiff.

Though instances of his arbitrery proceedings and injustice are numerous yet we site one of such things. Our ~~president~~ present munsiff posts about 200 cases for a single day in a month, and he ostensibely disposes all of them on that very day. But what he really does is he never writes a single line in any of that day's proceedings. Besides this the names of the defts. in such of the cas. fwhere summonses are personally served are never

called out at all. Thus the defts
though they are present before
the court are not in a position
either to state their defence or are to
know what has become of their
case. So convince the truth or
otherwise of this single fact we
beg you to direct a magestrate
or anyone authorased to peruse
the proceedings of the cases that
is to be disposed of on the 29th
August early on the morning of the 30th
without previous intimation
to any one. Then your Excellancy
will come to know the state of
the affairs of this court as well the
conduct of the tribunial.

Under these circumstances
we hope that at least this time your
Excellancy will not fail to take
into kind consideration these
our humble requests and do us
the needful and thus relieve us
from the hands of injustice and

partiality.

For which act of kindness we as in duty bound shall ever pray for your Excellency's long life and prosperity.

We beg to remain
your Excellency's most obidient and humble servants.

Dated
12th August 1899.

[illegible]
[illegible]

SECTION Courts (3)

FILE No. 959-98 89

From

SERIAL No. 3

31

THE SECY. TO THE GOVT. OF MYSORE,
GEN. & REV. DEPTS.

To

The deputy Commr.
Hassan District.

Dated } 4th ~~August~~ 1900 -
Despatched } 4th September 1900.
Received

General No. 3483
No. 359
Enclosure No. 11 papers
(vide slip attached)

His confidential letter dated 6th June 1900, to the address of the Dewan of Mysore.

It is satisfactory to note from the above report that the complaints made against the Amildars of Hole Narsipur are unfounded. The Petrs. will be informed accordingly.

~~Has the Govt. to~~ ~~return~~ the enclosures received with the above ~~letter~~ ~~being no longer required~~.

B.O.

Enclosures ~~red~~ with the above are herewith returned. BR 30/8

Mel 2018

for Secy:

No. 3484
V360

OFFICE OF THE ~~GOVERNMENT~~ OF MYSORE.

SECTION Judicial

JUDICIAL DEPARTMENT,

FILE No. 9598 V The 4th September 1900.

SERIAL No. 4

Endorsement granted to Rangamma and Seventy other residents of the town of Hole-narsipur in reply to their Petition ~~Registered No.~~ dated the 16th January ~~18~~ 1899 & 12th August 1899, to the address of the Resident and the Dewan of Mysore, respectively, complaining against ~~the behaviour of~~ Mr. K. B. S. Krishna Swamiengar, Munsiff of Hole-narsipur and requesting that he may be transferred to some other Court.

Petitioner is informed that

Petitioners are informed that their petitions having been referred to the Deputy Commissioner of Hassan for enquiry and report, he has reported that the complaints made against the said Munsiff are unfounded.

By order,

[illegible] 30/8.

~~General~~ Secretary.

mca
30/8

Refer
7.12.00

(5) 1900 33 J. 765

3484/360 4-9-900

SECTION Courts

No. 1083

Name of Petitioner Narasimha S/o

FILE No. 9508/98 Village

SERIAL No. 5 Taluk Hole-Narasipu

District Hassan

Date of Arzi 18-XI-00

Date of Receipt 29. XI-00

Date of Disposal

No. of Enclosure Nil

3 J 528

10/12

Transferred to Munsif Branch

Yes.

17-12-00
Recd 21/12

Refer to put up
DM
22-12-00.

ABSTRACT

Petitioners acknowledge receipt of the Govt Order No: 3484/360, given to them intimating that their Complaint against Sri Krishna Swamiengar the Munsiff of the place are unfounded. They represent that not one of them has put in the Signature to the

34
ion, that it gives them
pain to hear that they
complained against
Immisoff who is working
satisfactorily;
Therefore pray that if
their signatures have been
inserted in the original
petition the same may
be ordered to be sent to
Harasper for need-
ful action.

M.
XII 00.

1083

35

MYSORE DEWAN'S OFFICE
PETITION DEPARTMENT
RECD. 29-11-1900
DATE 29-11-1900

Read: (7) 37

Petition dated 18th November 1900. from Rangama and others of Hole-Narsipur, acknowledging receipt of this office endorsement No. 3484/360 d: 4th September 1900 to the effect that their complaints against Mr Krishnasamiengar the ~~late~~ Munsiff of the place were unfounded and representing that not one of them has put in his signature to ~~the so-called~~ any petition, and that it gives them much pain to hear that they have complained against the Munsiff who is ~~a~~ working most satisfactorily

Order thereon: No 8567-68/1953 3-1-1901

Record.

27/12/00

for Asst. Secy

against the said Munsiff and expressing their regret for the alleged complaints.

To The Dy. Comr. Hassan

In the Regr. Chf. Court's confirmation of this office docket No. 359 dated 4/1/01

Bangalore 38

(8)

SECTION Courts
FILE No. 95/98
SERIAL No. 7

27th Dec/00.

Dear Sir,

Adverting to the Hon'ble the Resident's D.O. of the 16th inst./99 addressed to the Diwan forwarding a petition & complaint against the Municipal Council Narsipur, I am desired to state that the allegations made therein were after due enquiry found to be groundless, and to forward for the information of the Hon'ble the Resident a copy of the proceedings of this date on the same subject.

I am Sir,
Your most obedient
Servant

Sub-Lt the
Hon. Secy.

Draft D.O.
First
Lt. Col.
Resd.

The Order & the D.O. may return
KA
27/12/01

D.O. despatched.
SM
3/1/02

(9) 39

Camp.

via BANGALORE.

12-I-07

THE RESIDENT MYSORE

To H. Ramanujayyan Esq
The Hon'ble Secretary to
the Judicial Branch

SECTION Confl.
FILE No. 95 G.C.P.
SER'AL NO.

My dear Mr. Thornton Chelly

Please refer to the Secretary's Demi official letter to Mr: Dobbs, regarding a Complaint, preferred to me direct, against the Munsiff of Hole Narsipur.

The Disposal of what was probably a Simple matter has

4P

taken nearly two years, and even after this extraordinary delay, the decision arrived at is barely intelligible. The petition was forwarded to me personally by some one in public, under circumstances which were explained in my letter of the 16th January 1899 to Sir Sheshadri Iyer. There should have been no difficulty in ascertaining who presented the petition. I presume it proposes to be signed by Rangama and others. Does

he and the others disclaim all knowledge of the Complaint? It may of course be entirely unfounded, but the account of the manner in which it has been disposed of leaves I ventured to think something to be desired. If it is entirely a bogus representation I suggest that some steps be taken to ascertain who imposed upon me, and also whether any State officials witnessed the imposture.

Yours sincerely
Owen Wister

I. R. A. Thumbscrew, Esq. C.E.
Mgr. Bureau of Imposture.

Sept 1677

1677 Brought before Council Sept 1677

Read & the Petition of Alderman North Proff of a Market & the Duty Customs & other materials before Govt are not such as to enable us to send a Letter for Royal Assent to the Resident - The enquiry by the Committee to have Members - time & place is nothing even to know that the said Petition emanated from the same Reasons as had a Reference to the first & second Petitions - Q

19-1-01

SECTION Courts

FILE No. 95-98

SERIAL No. Very Urgent

(10) 42

No: 2340 & 21-1-1901

& 1038 & 2-3-1901

Mem: Immediate

KLB 21/1/01

To

The Hy Com

Kapan DC

Correspondence ending with Govt Apo: No: 85-67-68 of the 3rd January 1901 re Petition from Rangoon traders of Hole Bandipur against Municipality re Maintenance of that Road.

Reverting to the above has the honor to forward for reference and early return Petition dtd 16th January 1901 addressed to the Honble the Resident, Petition dtd 12th August 1900 addressed to the Deputy Commr and Petition dtd 18th Nov 1900 also addressed to the Deputy Commr.

Very early submission of opinion is requested

43

on the following points
immediately after an Casual
Local Vacancy by the By-laws
thereof or Usage
of the Aforesaid:—
(1) Is the first
of the petitions
whereon reported to
genuine?
(2) Do the signatures
thereto admit their
signatures, or not
is there any real
doubt in regard
of such signatures?
(3) By whom
was that petition
presented to the
Board the Residents
in his Ward
and who were the
Duly elected
and Acting Present-
at the time of such
Presentation? &
Why did the Letter
fail to Note
of the Nonsense
if it was a bogus
petition?

(4) Who are the signatories to the third petition by 10th householders alleged to be? Are they the same as the persons by whom the first petition to the Resident & the second to the Queen had been signed? If so why do they disclaim all knowledge of them?

(5). Of the first or third & second petitions both are admitted or proved, why should not the signatories thereto be called upon to substantiate the allegations therein made, & if they fail to do so why should not suitable action be taken against them?

(6) Was any evidence or statement taken before from the signatories to the

last recorded relations
or any evidence,
of witnesses who
can recorded before
the Dy Comr dated his
Confidential Report
dated the 16th June 99
up to wherein
the record stood?

On submitting
mention a fortnight
from the date of
this communication
his report on the
General questions
raised above, the
Dy Comr should
also forward for
the perusal of
Govt statements
& evidence
already recorded
as well as those to be
now taken. The
Report should be
exhaustive and
should leave
no doubt unex-
-plicidated.

[illegible]
19/11/01

190 J 1182

46

FROM 11462 Dr 8-4-01.

The Deputy Commissioner,
Hatgan District.

SECTION Courts

FILE No. 4540/8

SERIAL No. 12

To

The Secretary to the Government of Mysore.
General and Rev: Departts.

(12)

Dated 6th April 1901.

Despatched 6th

Received

General No. 604

No. Leg 1 Memo

Enclosure No. 1 Letter
2 Lists A & B
4

Refer perhaps
9/401 Dr

Submitted for orders

Ack
11/4

His No. 9340 Dated 21st January 1038 June 1901, re petition from Ranganna and others of Hole Narsipur against Munsiff Dr Krishnaswamiengar of that place.

With reference to the above, have the honor to submit herewith report No: A Dated 10th March 1901 and its enclosures from Dr Aravamudiengar, Assistant Commissioner who

was

was deputed to hold
further enquiry in
the matter. A brief
memo of the under-
-signed is also appended.

Deputy Commissioner
Hazara District

Dist

Encl to Sl 10 (13/a) 47

Memo.

Secretary's Docket No: 9340/J.1038
Dated 21st January 1901 re
petition from Ramgama
and others of Hole Narsipur
against Munsiff M.N. Krishnaswami
Iyengar of that place was re-
-ferred to M.N. Aravamudiengar
for enquiry and report. His
report No: A Dated 10th March 19
together with its enclosures
are submitted to Government
for kind perusal and orders.
Six questions are raised in
the Secretary's Docket, of which
M.N. Aravamudiengar has tried
to answer five.

From the enquiries held
by him, the first of the petitions
he finds to be genuine and
the second pseudonymous,
while

while the third which was
in reply to the endorsement
from Government to Rangoon
and others originated under
circumstances which are de-
tailed by Mr. Aravamudiengar.
Having found the first petition
to be genuine, some of the
signatories thereto were called
on to substantiate the allegations
therein made. Mr. Aravamudiengar examined no
fewer than thirteen persons
who have signed the petition.
While two of them totally
denied their signatures, the
rest admit their having signed
the petition and state they
cannot substantiate the alle-
gations nor are they (except
Dasambhatta) aware of the
official misbehaviour of the
Munsiff.

Immisiff. They state that a petition was got up in English (by whom written, it was not ascertainable) and just at the moment of their going to meet the Honorable British Resident, it was taken round for being signed. While signing, they did not read through the petition and ascertain its contents.

It is evident from the statements recorded that the signatories are all Smarthas and had an intense feeling against the Sreevishnavas. When on the eve of the arrival of the Honorable British Resident to their town, a petition purporting to be complaints against the Sreevishnavas was taken round, it was readily

readily signed by the Swarthas present without, in the heat of the moment, caring to ascertain the whole contents and the consequences arising from the act of blindly signing the petition. Most of the persons are Shanbogues who would be the last persons to sign a petition containing unfounded allegations. The Agent of the Swamy Mutt is a power in the locality in sectarian matters and when he, as disclosed in the enquiry, took round the petition among his co-religionists they dared not question the contents thereof nor its propriety but had simply to respect his wishes and sign the petition. All these circumstances are only palliatives and

and do not altogether absolve them from noticing their conduct. I think a small fine or severe warning to the Shambogues would teach them a wholesome lesson and deter them from signing petitions without knowing their contents.

As regards the 6th point in the Secretary's Docket re-ferred to above, it should be mentioned that the enquiry being one of confidential nature, the persons concerned were orally examined as to the truth or otherwise of the allegations and no statement was taken from any of the Signatories nor any evidence of witnesses recorded in my presence.

Hence all the then available records were sub-mitted along with my con-fidential

52

Confidential report for the information of Government.

Further enquiry now held does not disclose fresh facts in respect of the alleged official misbehaviour of the Munsiff and beyond what has already been reported upon by me regarding sectarian animosity, there seems no grounds to throw any blame on the conduct of the Munsiff Mr. Krishnaswamiengar. —

D Devanarayan

Deputy Commissioner
Hassan District

bdj

Mis Reg no 1643
6.4.901.

General Assistant Commissioner's Office
Hassan District.

93

Dated Hassan 10th March 1901.

Rec'd 12.3.01

(12/3)

No: A.
Encs. Two Statements
& Two Records as per
Margin.

From, J. Narasimhaiyangar Esquire
B.A. & B.L.
General Assistant Commissioner
Hassan District.

To, The Deputy Commissioner
Hassan District.

Submit-
Report with
a brief memo
Draft-
Dll

12/3

Sir,

Adverting to your Memo A, dated 18th February 1901, forwarding for enquiry and report, Docket No: 9340, J. 1038 dated 21st January 1901, with its enclosures, from the Secretary to Government of Mysore, General and Revenue Departments, re a Petition from Ranganna and others of Holé Narasipur against Mr: Krishnaswamy Iyengar Amanuensis of that place, I have the honor to report that I proceeded to Holé Narasipur at

at the earliest available opportunity and held a careful personal enquiry in the matter. But owing to the considerable lapse of time I was not able to elucidate as clearly as I would wish, some of the points raised in the Secretary's docket referred to above. I had therefore to allow some more time, & wait and see if any further information was available. I made further enquiry on the subject during my recent presence in the town in connection with the Jesuits, but with no better result.

2. Statements were taken in the course of the enquiry from 15 persons most of them Signatories to the Petitions and two documents (a Government Endorsement and a Postal Receipt) produced by Sowda Ranganna were Exhibited.

I shall now answer the questions raised by the Secretary.

Questions 1 and 2-

"1. Is the first of the Petitions above referred to genuine?

2. Do the Signatories thereto admit their Signatures, and if not is there any evidence in proof of such Signatures?"

3. The first of the Petitions, the one dated 16th January 1899, appears to me

me to be genuine. 12 out of 71 persons subscribing to the Petition were examined and as many as 11 of them admit their signatures as will be seen from their statements, while the signature of Rangasamy himself, now dead, is admitted to be genuine by his son Bln. Rangasamy.

Further Ranga Varasiya the Sheikdar of Hole Varasipur Hobli, declares positively from his experience of the locality that he recognizes the signatures of as many as 48 persons. The percentage of the signatures identified is very large and would be even larger if the names of certain school boys who appear also to have subscribed to the Petition were eliminated. The Sheikdar states further that the signatures to the Petition are all Smarthas in persuasion, an opinion which appears to be borne out by a scrutiny of the names shown in column I of Statement A.

4. Your confidential Report on the

the subject forwarded & me with the records dealt at length on the Sectarian dissension of the place and shows how the Smarthas of the place were embittered against the other Sects, especially against the Sreevaishnavas, how certain irregularities and innovations were committed in the local temple to the detriment of Smartha Sectarian honor, how it is believed that these things were done at the instance or at the connivance of Mr. Krishna Swamy Iyengar and how as a consequence the Smarthas of the place had an intense feeling against him. It is therefore unnecessary for me to enter into these questions. From the known ill-feeling which the Smarthas entertained as a Sect against the Munsiff and the fact that all the Signatories to the Petition belong to that Sect, I am led to conclude that the Signatories could not have been unaware of the drift at least, of the Petition. But Dasam Bhatta's statement that preliminary to their proceedings

proceeding in a body to welcome Honor-
-able the Resident, the Swarthapopu-
-lation of the locality collected them-
-selves at the Ramadevaru Temple,
that the Petition in question was read
out and explained to the audience,
and that they were then exhorted
to affix their signatures to the Petition
which they did gladly, voluntarily and
with full knowledge of its contents,
appears to me to be a deliberate
exaggeration. The Petition was written
in English, a language to which the
majority of them were utter Strangers.
The Petition itself dealt at length
on the Specific Sectarian grievances
of the Swarthas and mentions only
incidentally the official misbehaviour
of the Amuniff. It is not improbable
that the person or persons who got up the
Petition omitted purposely to communicate
the latter portion to the assembled persons,
a supposition which is borne out by the

Statements

58

statements of the majority of the deponents. Further a practise seems to prevail in the town when a Petition to the Government is got up, to take it round to the other inhabitants, represent orally its contents or purport, solicit and obtain their signatures. Granting even that the present Petition is an instance of the kind, there is ample reason to presume that the gist of the Petition was within the knowledge of the signatories when they affixed their signatures to it.

Question 3: "By whom was that Petition presented to the Hon: the Resident in his carriage; who were the Durbar officers and officials present at the time of such presentation and why did the latter fail to take notice of the imposture if it was a bogus Petition?"

5. I have not been able to secure any satisfactory information regarding this question. Owing to the lapse of time and presumably also owing to the nature of the present enquiry itself, no person appears to be willing to come forward to give any definite statement as to who were the persons that

that presented the Petition and who were the Durbar officers or officials present at the time. From the evidence recorded and other local enquiry, however, I am able to gather that there were more than one Reception Pendals erected, that one of them was so put up in front of the "Traveller's Bungalow" where the Smartha Brahmins of the town were collected, that a number of them led by one Lakshmi Narayan Pandit (he represented himself as the local agent of the Sringeri Mutt - he is since dead.) welcomed Honorable the Resident with "Slokas", colored rice, flowers and fruits, that a Petition folded up - presumably the present one, was placed in the fruit tray, and presented with the fruits and that the Petition was retained by Honorable the Resident. Shanbhogue Venkatramaniya states that Mr. Soobha-rayalu Naidu, the Amildar of the place, was then present and per-mitted the presentation of fruits and flowers. But nothing further

is known as to who were the other officers present at the time or even if the Amildar himself was aware that a Petition was really presented with the fruits. No steps appear to have been taken by the Amildar in this connection either because he was ignorant of the presentation of the Petition or being aware of it he did not think any steps necessary in view of the fact that the Petition was apparently a genuine one -

4th question. "Who are the Sig-" 6. Before passing notices to the third Petition" & the next question, dated 18th November 1900, above" it may be adverted to? Are they the same" mentioned here as the persons by whom the" that the second first Petition to the Resident" of the Petitions and the Second to the Dewan" ie the one had been signed and if so" addressed to why do they disclaim all knowe" the Dewan of ledge of them?" Mysore, and dated 12th August 1899 is clearly a pseudonymous one and as such much bolder in its vituperation than the previous Petition.

The

The handwriting and the Signatures are feigned and it was not found possible to trace their authorship. There are however unmistakable traces pointing out its connection with the Sectarian clique from whom the first Petition emanated. No further notice need therefore be taken about this Petition. Coming to the Petition dated 18th November 1900, which is the last of the Series, the circumstances under which it was written were as follow:—

As the result of an enquiry held on the first Petition an Endorsement was issued by Government to one Rangama and others that their Petitions having been referred to the deputy-Commissioner for enquiry that Officer had reported that the complaints made against the said Ismail were unfounded." (Vide the Endorsement Submitted with the Record.) Unfortunately the initial letter "Bhu" (for Bhukinkere) before the name of Rangama was omitted

and

62

because the Endorsement was mis-delivered to one Jowda Rangama a Vaisya, the original "Bha" Rangama being by that time dead- This Jowda Rangama not having been privy to the Petition was surprised at the Endorsement, consulted his friends and other Merchants and concluded that a bogus Petition falsely purporting to have originated from him was presented to the Government. He and his friends decided that the Government should be Petitioned about the bogus nature of the Petition in question with a view to bring its authors to book and that personally they had no complaints whatever against Mr. Krishnaswamy Iyengar who was all that could be wished as a Munsiff. It will be seen from the statement A appended hereto that none of the Signatories to the third

Petition

Petition finds a place among the Subscribers to the first Petition. It is also remarkable that a great majority of them belong to non-Brahmanical classes while none of them belongs to the Smartha Sect. Under the circumstances and in their prevalent belief their desire to disclaim all knowledge of the first Petition appears to be natural and prompted by good instincts.

5th question.
"If either the first" "or the second Petition" "or both are admitted or proved," "why should not" "the Signatories" "thereto be called" "upon to substantiate" "the allegations" "therein made and" "if they fail to do" "so why should" "not suitable action" "be taken against" "them?"

7. I have given at some length my reasons for believing that the first Petition was unquestionably a genuine one, while the second Petition was pseudonymous, forged and a bogus one. Of the 11 persons who admit their Signatures to the first Petition, none is able or willing to substantiate the allegation contained in the Petition of official misbehaviour on the part of Mr. Krishnaswamy Iyengar. The statement certainly

certainly appears to have been prompted by malicious motives and engendered by sectarian animosity but yet it is not easy to see how the culprits can be brought to book without entailing upon Mr. Krishnaswamy Iyengar the trouble and anxiety of being a Prosecutor in a criminal Prosecution. There are however among the signatories to the first Petition a number of Government Servants as shown in statement B hereto appended.

A Departmental enquiry may be held in their case and if it is established that they had taken any part in the transaction some punishment for their share may be inflicted by way of fine or a short suspension from their offices. It is true that they allege their ignorance of the Petition in question containing any serious imputation against the Munsiff; but their very conduct in affixing their signatures to a Petition without

I

without knowing its contents deserves
serious notice. Even this will not fail
to have a wholesome effect upon the
officials and the inhabitants of the
town in pressing them, as it is likely
to do, that false allegations in a
Petition will not always go unpunish-
ed.

8. I have tried to answer to the
best of my information the various
questions raised by the Secretary ex-
-cepting the Sixth - I regret the delay
to some extent unavoidable in the
submission of this Report. I return
herewith the records forwarded by
you as per Enclosure A. The Enclosure
B gives the Petitions, Statements and
Exhibits which are enclosures to the
present report.

I have the honor to be, Sir,
Your most obedient Servant.

Chas Lamm Dec
Deputy Assistant Commissioner
Hawaii District

A

Names of Signatories to the Petitions against Mr. Krishnaswamy Iyer Munsiff of Holenarasipur

Signatories to Petition No: I dated 16th January 1899, presented to the Hon: the Resident.		Signatories to Petition No: II dated 12th August 1899, addressed to the Dewan		Signatories to Petition No: III dated 15th November 1900, to the address of the Dewan		Remarks
Serial No:	Name	Serial No:	Name	Serial No:	Name	
1.	B. Rangamma	1.	Bheemamma	1.	G. Rangamma Setty	
2.	Rangappa Hiriyamma	2.	Ananthasetty	2.	Koneri Ranga Setty	
3.	Thimmappa Jayaram Shanbhogue	3.	Ranga	3.	Chikka Janardana Setty	
4.	Chamarayya Siddappa	4.	Hamma	4.	K. Krishna Setty	
5.	Agraharada Kanyamdeya	5.	Siddejowda	5	Narasimha Setty	
6.	Sheshabhatta	6.	Kanjunda	6.	Narasimha Setty & mark	
7.	H. L. Narahari bhatta	7.	Boregowda	7.	Putta Janardana Setty	
8.	M. Soobba Rao	8.	Anandiya	8.	Janardana Setty	
9.	Soonhada Kanjappa	9.	Narayanna	9.	Soora setty	
10.	Yoga Narasimhabhatta	10.	Dyavejowda	10.	Chinni Setty	
11.	Soonhada Kanjappa	11.	Narasimhya	11.	Kijja	
12.	M. Narasimhya	12.	Bairah	12	Narayanna	
13.	C. Kapanipatti Sastry	13.	Venkata	13	Karibasetty	
14.	H. Kanjiya	14	Thimmappa	14	Koneri Kanjappa	
15.	Thallikere Kanyam deya	15	Siddaya	15	Soobla setty	

Encl to letter (13) dated 15/1/01

96

16. Kapanipathi bhatta —
17. Gunjeda Gopaliya —
18. Lakshmi narayan Pundit
19. Dasambhatta —
20. Doddamane Venkatramanya.
21. D. Venkatramanya —
22. Doddamane Gundappa —
23. K. D. Shankaramarappa
24. Shivaramiya —
25. Narasimha Shastry —
26. Seetharamiya —
27. Lakshmi narasimha Sastry
28. H. Shelviya Shanbhoge
29. Venkamiya —
30 Narasimhiya —
31. C. Ranganna Sastry
32. K. Gopaliya
33. Ramiya —
34 Shippiya —
35. Nagappiya —
36. Soorappa Shettikere gordian
37. H. Hiriyammiya —
38. Ramanappa —

16 Soobbarayg Setty
17 S. Dodda Mallappa setty
18 A. Venkatara setty
19 Putta Gangaliya
20 Suna Venkatsoobbaiah
21 Hanumanthasam Setty
22 Goondappa
23 Bogra setty
24 S. Shikhamallappa Setty
25 Polu Shippiya setty
26 A. Soobbarayg Setty
27 Thimmiya
28 Veerabhadra Setty
29 Dasa Setty
30 Safarkhan
31 S. Seetharama Setty
32 S. Ajjiya
33 S. Venkatasoobba setty
34 S. Naiya Setty
35 S. Mallappa swamy
36 Venkataraya Setty
37 Krishna Setty
38 Rama Setty

39. Venkat-Narasayya —
40. Ramanna —
41. Soobba Sastry —
42. Kapanipathi bhatta —
43 — D. Krishnappa —
44 Thimmanna —
45 Venkatarayya Sastry —
46. Yoganarasimha Sastry —
47 — Krishnappa —
48 Nanjoondabhatta —
49 Soobbiya —
50. Soobbanna —
51 — Nosale Thimmarayappa —
52. Venkatramabhatta —
53. Kalappa Sastry —
54. D. Srinivasappa —
55 Krishnappa —
56. Degarthi-Narasimhiya —
57. Degarthi Nanjhoppa Venkatsoobbiya —
58 Narasimha Sastry
59 Puttanniya —

60	Seemarauiya					
61	Ramabhatta					
62	Soondappa					
63	Ramanna					
64	Shelviya					
65	Shankariya					
66	Soorappa					
67	N. Soobbaraya					
68	Sanjiv Seetharamiya					
69	K. Soobba Rao					
70	Chittankalli Sivaramaiya Kasibhatta					
71	Chennarayappabhatta					

Dated Hassan
the March 1901.

Khanderao
Personal Assistant Commissioner
Hassan District.

B.

List of Govt: Servants that have Subscribed to Petition No: I dated 16th January 1899 presented to the Hon: the Resident—

6 3 (2)

Serial No:	Serial No: in Petition I	Name and designation of Official Signatories		Remarks—
		Name -	Designation -	
1	3	Thimmappiya..	Shanbhogue of Sanjūr.	Gone to SLP
2	10	Yogakāroshimhabhatta	Teach in Sanscrit Pātāsala—	
3.	12	D. Narasimhiya	Shanbhogue of Maviahkere.	
4.	14	K. Ranjiya..	Copyist— I Volunteer in the Taluk office—	
5.	15	Thatteheri Ranjundiya	Shanbhogue of Ramadevam Sarvamanya village.	
6.	17	Gopaliya—	Shanbhogue of Ginjiya	
7.	20	Doddamane Venkatramaiya	Shanbhogue of Dakshina Kalai	
8	22	Doddamane Goundappa	do of Doddabyapatharalle	
9	23	K. D. Shankaranarayanappa	Taluk Gumastas.	
10	26	Seetha Ramiah	Shanbhogue of Kerle	
11	28	N. Thelviya..	do of Kittanala	
12	30	Narasimhiya.	do of Chennapatna	
13	37	N. Hiriyanniya	Kanaree School Master	
14	38	Karanappa	Kuzzai Gumastha.	
15	43	D. Krishnappa	Hirihalli Patēl.	
16	49	Soobbiya	Shanbhogue of Hoodal Hippa	
17	57	Venkatsoobbiya.	do of Kegartte	
18	63	Ramanna	Ag: Sheristadar of Doddaladavas.	
19	68	Sanjūr Seetha Ramiya	Shanbhogue of Kiriyanni	

Dated Hassan
6th March 1907.

Khadamundiya
General Agent Court Commissioner
Hassan District

Jagirdar
Refer Pattup
MM
12/4/01.

1900

(14) 68

From 11617
10-4-01.

The Deputy Commissioner,
Kadur District.

SECTION Courts
FILE No. 0597
SERIAL No.

To
The Secretary to the
Government of Mysore
General and Rev. Departts.

Dated 9th April 1901.
Despatched 9th
Received

General No. 614
No.

Enclosure No. nil

† Reminder-Destroyed.

Secretary's Reminder Docket
No: 1321 Dated 6th Instant
J. 1369
calling for information
re the petition presented
to the Honorable the
Resident by Ramgowda
and others inhabitants
of Holé Narsipur against
Mr. B. Krishnaswamiengar
Munsiff of that place.

In reply, has the honor
to state that the informa-
tion called for has
been furnished in this
office

No. 11442
9

Office No. 604. Dated 6th
Instant.

[signature]

Deputy Commissioner
Hazara District

lif

SECTION Courts

FILE No. 95998

SER'AL No. 19

69

15 16

No: 15926/1586 dt 30-5-1901

Encl 2

To,

The First Assistant to the
Resident in Mysore.

Sir,

With reference to the Hon'ble Resident's D.O.letter of the 12th January last to the address of the late officiating Dewan, Mr.Thumbu Chetty, regarding the circumstances under which a complaint was presented to him direct, at Hole Narasipur, against the Munsiff of that place, I am directed to state as follows:-

From enquiries made by the local officers of the Hassan District it seems clear that the petition delivered to the Hon'ble the Resident was a genuine one, ~~as 48 out of 71~~ signatures have been identified, while 11 out of 12 persons examined, have actually admitted their signatures. The first in order of the signatories, namely, "Bhu Ranganna" is dead, but the genuineness of his signature ~~is admitted by his~~. This petition was fully enquired into by the Deputy Commissioner of the Hassan District and his report which was lying undisposed of for more than a year was dealt with by the Offg. Dewan

he found that the many of the allegations against the Munsiff were not true and that the Munsiff maintained a good character in the discharge of his judicial work.

70

& an endorsement was under his orders given to the petitioners, a copy of which is herein enclosed for information. This ~~endorsement is dated~~ 4th September 1900 ~~and is~~ marked X, ~~among the enclosures of this letter.~~ This endorsement was ~~by mistake~~ by a mistake delivered to a wrong person and taking advantage of this ~~mistake~~ circumstance an endeavour was made to turn the ~~advantage~~ opportunity to the Munsiff's favour, and a ~~pseudonymous~~ petition signed by several ~~fictitious~~ persons was the outcome in which the former petition was denied and the Munsiff was praised. ~~This petition was regarded as a true document and as~~ As ~~it~~ this petition coincided with the report of the Dy. Commissioner already referred to it was recorded and a copy of ~~it~~ the proceedings sent to the Hon'ble Resident. This order of Government by itself was no doubt not a complete report and failed to convey an adequate ~~report~~ idea of what had been done in the matter. This could have been explained when the D.O. letter now under reply was received, but a fresh and more exhaustive enquiry was deemed necessary and an Assistant Commissioner of the Hassan District was, under the orders of the Deputy Commissioner deputed to conduct it.

[Call this "1". Vide Seignder & Co's 01]

The following extract from that officer's report embodies all the information available as to the circumstances attending the presentation of the first petition to the Hon'ble the Resident.

"Owing to the lapse of time and presumably also owing to the nature of the present enquiry itself, no person appears to be willing to come forward to give any definite statement as to who were the persons that presented the petition , and who were the Durbar Officers or officials present at the time. From the evidence recorded and other local enquiry, however, I am able to gather that there were more than one reception pendals erected, and that one of them was so put up in front of the travellers' Bungalow where the Smartha Brahmins of the town were collected, that a number of them led by one Lakshaminarayana Pandit who represented himself as the local agent of the "Sringeri Matt" and is since dead, welcomed the Hon'ble Resident with "Slokas", coloured rice, flowers and fruits , that a petition folded up, presumably the present one, was placed in the fruit tray, and presented with the fruits, and that the petition was retained by the Hon'ble Resident. Shanbhogue Venkatramanaiyya states that Mr. Subrayalu Naidu, the Amildar of the place was then present and permitted the presentation of fruits and flowers. But nothing further is known as to who were the other officers present at the time, or even if the Amildar himself was aware that a petition was really presented with the

72

the fruits. No steps appear to have been taken by the Amildar in this connection either because he was ignorant of the presentation of the petition, or being aware of it, he did not think any steps necessary in view of the fact that the petition was apparently a genuine one". This Amildar has never been considered a very competent officer and is now transfered to the Haddagerd Taluk.

Copy of the Deputy Commissioner's letter on which the endorsement to the petition presented to the Hon'ble the Resident was based is also forwarded herewith and forms enclosure No.2. Mr.Krishnaswamiengar, the Munsiff referred to has also been transferred from Holenarsipur and further action seems to be uncalled for.

Why is one enclosure No. A & another 2? Both shd be of the same series unless different in subject matter &c. Seshu Iyer 20.5.01

19.V.01

I have etc.,

Secretary. 20/5/1901

Typed. 21/5/01